

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/465,634	12/17/1999	DAVID K. VAVRO	INTL-0286-US	9115
7590 07/28/2005		EXAMINER MEONSKE, TONIA L		
TIMOTHY N TROP				
	R HU & MILES PC REEWAY STE 100		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
HOUSTON, T	X 77024		2183	
	•		DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

plicant(s)		
VAVRO ET AL.		
t Unit		
83		

before the rilling of all Appear blief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tonia L. Meonske	2183					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 18 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	f Appeal. To avoid at ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have							
been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	atutory period for reply originally set in the	final Office action; or (2)	as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROP							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
		omnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Applicants reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro 		rill be entered and an	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:	Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		Laking of Americal codes	4 4				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	•	• • •	•				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but the request for reconsidered but the request for reconsideration has been considered but the request for reconsideration has been considered but the request for reconsideration has been considered but the reconsidered but	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:				
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
13. Other:	(
•							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

On page 2, Applicant argues in essence:

"All of the vector address generators do is generate addresses for memories which are internal to the digital signal processor. They have nothing to do with processing output signals form the digital signal processor. The asserted output signals, in the form of elements 18 and 26, are both inputs to the element 20a, as clearly shown in Figure 1. The outputs are indicated as coming from the elements 12 and 24. But if the outputs come from the element 24, then how in the world can it be said that the element 20a is the output processor?"

However, elements 20a, 12, and 24 are a part of the claimed digital signal processor. Any output from any of the elements of the digital signal processor is considered an output of the digital signal processor. Elements 12 and 24 provide output signals to element 20a via elements 18 and 26. Element 20a processes these output signals, therefore element 20a is in fact an output processor that processes signals from the digital signal processer, elements 12 and 24. Therefore this argument is moot.

EDDIE CHAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100